

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/627,759	07/28/2003	Isoji Yao	030858	4426
23850	7590 08/05/2005		EXAM	INER
ARMSTRONG, KRATZ, QUINTOS, HANSON & BROOKS, LLP			PAIK, SANG YEOP	
1725 K STRE	ET, NW		DAREN AUDITO	
SUITE 1000			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGTO	N, DC 20006		3742	

DATE MAILED: 08/05/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/627,759	YAO, ISOJI			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Sang Y. Paik	3742			
The MAILING DATE of this communical Period for Reply	tion appears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 3 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communic - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) di - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statuto - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply with, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATION. 7 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a cation. ays, a reply within the statutory minimum of thi ry period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MOI by statute, cause the application to become A	reply be timely filed ty (30) days will be considered timely. NTHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed of	on <u>04 May 2005</u> .				
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b)	This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final.				
* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the ments is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims					
4) Claim(s) 1-5 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are version 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 5) Claim(s) 1-5 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction	withdrawn from consideration.				
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the E 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) Applicant may not request that any objectio Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by	☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to n to the drawing(s) be held in abeya e correction is required if the drawing	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). (s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 					
Attachment(s)					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		Summary (PTO-413)			
 Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO Paper No(s)/Mail Date 		s)/Mail Date nformal Patent Application (PTO-152) 			

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1, 2, 4 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugo (US 5,076,467) in view of Langmuir et al (US 2,437,963) or Ohnishi et al (US 5,186,120), Benade et al (US 6,072937), and Hutchinson (US 6,647,204).

Sugo shows a steam-supply apparatus including a pressurized steam sent from a steamgenerating portion through an electromagnetic valve and a connecting tube. However, Sugo does not show providing a heater to the steam-blowing portion, the connecting tube being flexible, and a return pipe.

Langmuir shows a steam-supplying apparatus having a steam generating portion and a steam blowing portion where a heater is provided to the steam blowing portion to maintain the desired steam pressure and temperature. Ohnishi also shows providing a vapor generating portion and a vapor blowing portion where a heater is provided to the vapor blowing portion to maintain the desired vapor pressure and temperature. Benade shows a steam generator with a flexible tube connected to the steam generator to direct the steam out of the steam chamber. Hutchinson shows a steam apparatus having a steam by pass valve that returns the heated steam back to the water supply (see Figure 24).

Application/Control Number: 10/627,759 Page 3

Art Unit: 3742

In view of Langmuir or Ohnishi, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to provide the heater to the steam-blowing portion to maintain the desired steam pressure and temperature. Furthermore, the claimed heating steam circulation passage would inherently be present in the electromagnetic valve in order to pass the steam there through and would also be heated by the heated steam. In view of Benade, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to adapt Sugo with a flexible connecting tube so that the steam can be conveniently directed in a flexible direction. In view of Hutchinson, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to adapt Sugo with a return pipe to control the output of the heated steam and to divert the unused or excess heated steam to the water supply for reuse.

3. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sugo in view of Langmuir or Ohnishi, Benade, and Hutchinson as applied to claims 1, 2, 4 and 5 above, and further in view of Yamaguchi et al (US 5,803,938).

Sugo in view of Langmuir or Ohnishi, Benade, and Hutchinson shows the structure claimed except a pressure-reducing valve disposed on a steam passage between the boiler and the electromagnetic valve.

Yamaguchi shows a pressure adjuster (31) disposed between the vaporization chamber and a steam outlet valve. In view of Yamaguchi et al, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to adapt Sugo, as modified by Langmuir or Ohnishi, Benade, and Hutchinson, with a pressure reducing or adjuster valve to further control the rate at which the steam is generated and sent to the steam outlet valve including the electromagnetic valve.

/

Application/Control Number: 10/627,759

Art Unit: 3742

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

The applicant argues the applied prior art Langmuir and Ohnishi are nonanalogous art to Sugo. While these prior art involve different applications, they are in the same field of endeavor which is in the field of generating steam or vapor with an electrical heating element, and furthermore these prior art are reasonable pertinent to the particular problem with which the applicant was concerned which is to maintain the desired pressurized steam. Thus, the applicant's argument is not deemed persuasive.

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Application/Control Number: 10/627,759 Page 5

Art Unit: 3742

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sang Y. Paik whose telephone number is 571-272-4783. The

examiner can normally be reached on M-F (9:00-4:00) First Friday Off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robin Evans can be reached on 571-272-4777. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Sang Y Paik
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3742

syp